DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 080 SP 006 120

AUTHOR Bessent, Hattie; Cage, B. N.
TITLE Richmond, Virginia Career Opportunities Program: An Assessment.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. for Development of Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 72
NOTE 85p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Disadvantaged Youth; *Low Income Groups; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; Teacher Aides; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Programs

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates a Career Opportunities Program (COP) in the Richmond Public School System, Virginia--one of many COP programs which train adults from model cities' neighborhoods for new careers in education. The report specifies that 150 participants served as auxiliary personnel in 32 Richmond schools and that the educational phase of the program was conducted jointly at Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Universities. The program and curricula of the Career Opportunities Program (COP) are described briefly, with participant requirements for selection given. The involvement of COP with other programs for disadvantaged children is also discussed. Evaluation techniques are described particularly opinionnaires and checklists. The evaluation focused on (a) assessment of self-concept and attitudes of COP and non-COP participants toward various characteristics in the teaching process, (b) assessment of the self-concept of children in classrooms with COP and non-COP aides, and (c) comparison of ratings of university and public school staff concerning performance and personal characteristics of the COP and non-COP participants. Reported results show that (a) a gain in interpersonal adequacy for both groups was achieved; (b) COP participants' ratings on classroom organization and planning sessions with the teacher were significant as were non-COP ratings on student relationship; and (c) attitudes of COP aides, as measured by a semantic differential scale, increased significantly toward the COP.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 073080

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM: AN ASSESSMENT

Dr. Hattie Bessent
Dr. B.N. Cage

SP 006 120

University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601
July, 1972

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM: AN ASSESSMENT

Dr. Hattie Bessent
Dr. B.N. Cage

* * * * * * * * *

The evaluation and analysis of data reported herein were conducted under Letter of Agreement by and between the Richmond, Virginia Public Schools and Drs. Hattie Bessent and B. N. Cage.

Funds for this evaluation were provided under the Education Professions Development Act, U.S.O.E., Local Education Agency contribution.

* * * * * * * * *

University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

July, 1972

FOREWORD

Children of families living in model cities areas have often found school distasteful and providing limited successful experiences. Excessive pupil-teacher ratio and too often, teachers not from the immediate community, aided this dilemma especially in adult-child role relations. The Career Opportunities Program strives to overcome these limitations by putting indigenous persons into the classroom which at the same time reduces the teacher-pupil ratio.

This study attempts an assessment of the current Career Opportunities Program in Richmond, Virginia. The study could not have been accomplished without the assistance of many people. Gratitude is extended to Mr. Nathaniel Lee, Director of Federal Programs and his staff; Mrs. Alice Howard, Director of Career Opportunities Program and her staff; Dr. James W. Tyler, Assistant Superintendent; Dr. Claude Sandy, Research Department and his staff; Dr. Berhens, Guidance Department and his staff; Virginia Union Faculty, Virginia Commonwealth Faculty, Principals, Teachers, and Paraprofessionals of schools participating in the Career Opportunities Program.

PARTICIPATING AND CONTRIBUTING PERSONNEL

Richmond Public School System

Dr. James Tyler

Dr. Paul Berhens

Mr. Nathaniel Lee

Mr. Edward DeFore

Dr. Claude Sandy

Virginia Union University

Dr. A. James

Dr. Dorothy Cowling

Mrs. Julia Thornton

Virginia Commonwealth University

Dr. Warren Brandt

Dr. Evelyn Fulbright

Mrs. Gertrude Freeman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	ii
Participating and Contributing Personnel	iii
List of Tables	v
Chapter	
I. Career Opportunities Program	1
Introduction	1
Problem	1
Program and Curricula	2
Structure of Programs at Virginia Union University and Virginia Commonwealth University	4
Recruitment and Selection	5
Criteria	6
In-Service Training	7
Linkages With Other Programs	8
COP Council	8
Youth Tutoring Youth	9
II. Research Design and Methodology	11
Instrumentation	12
Hypotheses	13
Limitations	14
III. Data Analysis and Interpretation	16
IV. Summary and Recommendations	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP participants at the Conclusion of Twelve (12) Program Months	17
II.	Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP Participants at the Conclusion of Twenty-one (21) Program Months	17
III.	Means and F-ratios for Twelve (12) Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of Twelve (12) Program Months	18
IV.	Means and F-ratios for Twelve (12) Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of Twenty-one (21) Program Months	19
V.	Means and Corresponding t-Values for Attitudes Toward Selected COP Variables Collected at the Conclusion of 12 and 21 Months, Respectively	21
VI.	Percentage of Ratings on Five Performance Criteria by Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Supervising Teachers	22
VII.	Distribution of Ten Responses on Selected Criteria From the University Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire	23
VIII.	Distribution of Thirteen Responses from Principals on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP Aides	25
IX.	Distribution of Twenty-Seven Responses From Teachers on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP Aides	26
X.	Distribution of 274 Responses From Students on Selected Performance and Personal Characteristics Exhibited by COP-Aides Ratings (in percent)	28
XI.	Means and Corresponding F-ratio for the I Feel - Me Feel Self Concept Scale for Kindergarten Through Fourth Grade of Experimental and Control Groups	29

List of Tables - Continued

Table		Page
XII.	Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 5-6 of the Experimental and Control Groups.....	30
XIII.	Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 7-8 of the Experimental and Control Groups.....	30

CHAPTER I

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Introduction

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) was funded in 1970 for a period of three years under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), Public Law 90-35, Part D to train adults from model cities' neighborhoods for new careers in the field of education. During the Fall, 1971, the evaluation team of Drs. Hattie Bessent and B. N. Cage were contracted by the Richmond Public Schools to evaluate the Career Opportunities Program. This report contains significant aspects of the program curricula, the research design, instrumentation, data analyses, and summary.

Problem

The purpose of this project was the evaluation of the Career Opportunities Program in the Richmond Public School System, Richmond, Virginia. This evaluation was initiated at the beginning of the second year of operation. At that time, there were approximately 150 participants assigned to 32 different schools. The participants served as auxiliary personnel, the majority of them being teacher aides. The training and educational phase of the program was conducted through the cooperative efforts of Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Universities. Seventy-five participants were assigned to each institution. The overall

objectives of the Career Opportunities Program as given in the Federal guidelines were as follows:

1. To help students in the Model Cities Schools to improve their academic achievement level through the use of COP trainees as teacher aides, teacher helpers, and assistant teachers in the classroom as measured by standardized tests, teacher tests, and teacher judgments.

2. To help students to understand the value of achieving success in school as measured by self-reports and observation techniques of professionals and paraprofessionals.

3. To help paraprofessional trainees demonstrate their ability to academically achieve in college courses as measured by the evaluations of the college instructors.

4. To help schools of education at Virginia Union University and Virginia Commonwealth University demonstrate their ability to cooperatively organize and provide college training programs for paraprofessionals that will prepare them for new careers in education as measured by the ultimate placement of the trainees in educational positions.

5. To help those schools in the Model Neighborhood to demonstrate application of the concept of differentiated staffing in the organization of professionals and COP trainees and to provide enriched educational experiences for their students as observed by administrators, professional and paraprofessional personnel, and citizens of the community.

Program and Curricula

Career Opportunities Program (COP) on Instructional Teams is a federally funded project to train adults from low-income areas to work on instructional teams attuned to the needs of children in deprived areas. Special attention is given to veterans since it is believed that the male image will be beneficial to disadvantaged children living in fatherless homes.

COP is designed to improve the educational achievement of youth in the model cities' neighborhoods through the training of paraprofessionals from the neighborhood for new careers in the field of education. Paraprofessionals and veterans are employed in the Richmond Public School System while participants in college programs that could ultimately prepare them as professional degree teachers. The program is seen as a partnership of school, college, community, and the State Department of Education. Its aim is to enable children from primarily model city areas to learn more effectively in the classroom. With the help of paraprofessionals to relieve them of some of their duties, teachers have more time to devote to instruction. Teachers are able to give more individual attention and thus, have more time to reach more children. Also when paraprofessionals are trained, teachers can delegate certain tasks which they themselves would otherwise not have time to do.

The Career Opportunities Program aims to serve both as a vehicle and catalyst for bringing about improvement in school organizations and curriculum. The initial training phase for 50 paraprofessionals, under the sponsorship of the COP program authorized under Public Law 90-35, Part D, Education Professions Development Act of Virginia Union University, began June 8, 1970. The program at Virginia Commonwealth University began June 15, 1970.

At the beginning of the second year of operation, 100 additional participants entered the program. Of the 150 total, there were 40 males (veterans) and 110 females. These COP-aides were assigned to 32 schools, consisting of 29 elementary and three middle schools.

During the summer each COP participant earns nine semester credit hours at his respective college. During the regular school year participants earn 9 to 18 hours per semester. Many activities were organized during the class orientation to education which was conducted for three weeks at both participating universities.

Structure of Programs at Virginia Union University and Virginia Commonwealth University

The training and educational phase of this program is being conducted through the cooperative efforts of Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Universities. Seventy-five participants are assigned to each institution. Participants are entitled to services provided for other college students as well as additional services necessitated by the program.

The paraprofessionals who came into the program had completed high school or had earned an equivalency certificate. It is estimated that more than one-third of these persons had previous college experience and were admitted to an advanced academic program.

Provisions are made for each participant to take a special course called Orientation to Education in addition to their regular college courses. This specially designed course provides concentrated study in the areas needed to meet the special needs of the students in each university. This opportunity provides exposure in child growth and development, the teaching process, curriculum techniques for promoting teaching and learning audio visual materials, art education, music education, health education, language arts, and human and public relations. The following objectives were set forth as primary to the

orientation course:

1. To provide opportunities for teacher aides to study and learn how they can serve as efficient assistants in the classroom.

2. To introduce new materials, methods and techniques for working with children and to help guide aides in implementing some of these techniques.

3. To provide opportunities for observation in classroom situations of teacher and teacher aide working in all curricular areas using audio-visual aides, art materials, and special teaching techniques.

4. To help aides gain a better insight as well as an understanding of children from pre-kindergarten through senior high.

5. To provide opportunities for the staff, teachers and teacher aides to discuss and analyze human and public relations in the classroom and school in general.

6. To help aides evaluate their work in an educational setting.

During the orientation period each aide is given time to work with and observe children in the classroom and on the playground. At the end of the observation period the body of paraprofessionals come together to discuss their needs, the problems they encounter with children and the many general understandings needed to help govern the daily life in the classroom.

Recruitment and Selection

The Richmond Public Schools has employed paraprofessionals since 1963. Therefore, recruitment of participants was achieved through selection of applicants from those presently employed in various federal programs in the system. The following criteria

were used in the selection process:

Criteria

1. Each participant must have a high school diploma or its equivalent.

2. Each participant must be employed by the Richmond Public Schools (except veterans).

3. Aides living and working in the model cities area will get first preference.

4. Aides living in the model cities area but are assigned to other schools in the city will get second preference.

5. Aides living in other areas of the city but working in the model cities schools will get third preference.

6. Aides living in the east end area (a poverty area of Richmond) will get fourth preference.

7. Aides with some college experience assigned to other schools will get fifth preference.

Veterans were recruited through cooperative arrangements with the transition office at Ft.Lee, Virginia. Other methods of recruitment were through advertisement in the newspaper, on television and radio.

The teachers who were chosen to participate in COP were selected on the basis of their expressed desire to be involved in this program and the recommendations of their principals. The recommendations were based on the demonstrated commitment of teachers to improve the achievement level of the children and their ability to cooperatively work with other adults to achieve this goal.

Each school is staffed with a team leader who serves as the liaison between the school and the administrative staff. Her responsibilities are:

1. To supervise the total COP program in the school.

2. To encourage aides to excel in all of their work.

3. To communicate with the advisors of both universities on the progress of the aides.

4. To help plan in-service training for professionals and paraprofessionals.

5. To stress the importance of attending classes and tutoring sessions.

6. To keep principals informed on the progress of the Career Opportunities Program

7. To stress the importance of developing learning teams to help improve the quality of education.

8. To help evaluate participants as well as the total COP program.

In-Service Training

COP teachers and aides participate in periodic in-service training sessions. The objective of these sessions is to get trainees to understand and utilize the necessary elements for a successful learning team and to introduce innovative principles and concepts and their implementation.

The first year of in-service training sessions were concentrated in the following areas:

1. Team planning

2. Supervision and evaluation

3. Roles of team members

4. Grievance procedures

5. Student's image of aides

6. Placement of aides

7. The school as a learning vehicle

8. Communication among teachers, aides, and children

9. Teachers and aides beliefs in education

The second year in-service training sessions concentrated on the following areas:

1. Performance objectives
2. Early childhood educational principles and their implementation
3. The young child's growth and development
4. Open classroom concepts
5. Human and public relations

Linkages With Other Programs

Paraprofessionals have been employed to assist teachers in many federal programs. Numerous persons working in various federal programs were selected to participate in COP to help decrease academic deprivation in students. The COP program has been linked with programs such as Title I ESEA, Operation Uplift, Head Start, Follow Through, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Local Education Association, Model Cities, Veterans Administration and the EPDA - B2 Project.

The experiences gained by COP participants will improve their contributions to deprived children in these other programs. The model neighborhood contains all the federal programs, and each program has representation. The majority of the participants demonstrate the ability to successfully achieve in college courses and exhibit a sincere desire to enter an educational career devoted primarily to working with deprived children.

COP Council

The COP Council is the Board of Directors of the COP Project.

Membership in the council includes representatives from both traditional as well as more recently formed organizations, together with other community residents, parents, and older students who live in the area. The school district and cooperating universities are represented. Each of these components -- schools, university, and the community -- play a major role in the project.

The COP Council conducts interviews and screens applicants interested in participating in the program. The major basis for selecting the participants were: 1) commitment to working with deprived children in the model cities area, 2) interest in helping to improve the quality of education, and 3) interest in improving one's own educational background.

Youth Tutoring Youth

The COP has a Youth Tutoring Youth (YTY) in its design. The "Right to Read Youth Tutoring Youth Program" commenced June, 1970 in cooperation with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. There were twenty-five (25) youths selected to participate with COP -- ranging in age from 14 to 16 years old. The idea of having teenagers tutor elementary and secondary school children is a worthwhile innovation. This concept challenges tutors as well as the tutees. In many instances tutors are inspired to do outside reading and planning for their lessons.

Before the tutors are assigned to the schools, they participate in a three-day workshop to give them an overall idea of the program, their basic duties, and many interesting ways of presenting materials. These workshops are conducted by the tutor's supervisors.

There are many reasons for the success of the program during the summer. For example, the tutors are allowed to choose the school in which they want to work. The closeness of ages in the tutor and tutee establishes a warm working relationship and the tutors are treated as adults in most cases and not as children.

The YTY program operates during the school day as well as after school hours within facilities and by the resources provided by the Richmond Public Schools. The teachers in each school work with the coordinator and supervisors of YTY in helping implement the tutorial program. They identify students at the beginning of the program who could best profit from these tutorial services.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) was initiated based on the underlying assumption of planned variation strategy. To effect change in the system of training teachers and auxiliary aides implies a research and development program which involves process development and change. Evaluation of any one aspect of this type program does not preclude justifiable conclusions, but does demand a systematic approach to evaluation and an attempt to measure as many program characteristics as are quantifiable. Conclusions can be drawn only after all process and product assessments have been made and analyzed. This requires a systematic perusal of the program objectives from which measurable outcomes can be identified and assessed.

The research design chosen to approach this type of evaluation depended heavily on opinions and interview responses from those people involved most in actuating the program. Time series measurements were made at the end of 12 and 21 program months on the experimental and control groups. Assessment of children in classrooms where participants of the experimental and control groups worked was also made at the second data collection point.

Of the 150 Career Opportunities program participants at the beginning of the second program year, 56 subjects (Ss) were randomly selected to compose the experimental group. A control group of equal

size was chosen for comparison purposes matched on school (location), grade level taught, and race. Because of attrition over the second program year, sample sizes decreased to 49 COP Ss and 39 non-COP Ss at the second data collection point.

Five children were randomly selected from each of the classrooms in which the experimental and control Ss were assigned. Self-report, self-concept data were collected on each child, with the instrument being administered by the COP Ss. Each COP participant administered the instrument to five children in his classroom and to five other children in a control classroom. The control students were selected based on grade level and location of school for comparative purposes to the experimental students.

Instrumentation

In keeping with the underlying philosphy of process and process-impact evaluation of the COP program, various instruments, opinionnaires, and checklists were used to gather data. A copy of each is found in the Appendix with the exclusion of nationally used tests.

The self-report, self-concept of the experimental and control Ss was measured by use of the How I See Myself Self Concept Scale.[1] This instrument contains 40 items using a Likert scale and produces four (4) factors relating to self. The factors are: 1) interpersonal adequacy, 2) school and physical adequacy, 3) personal appearance, and 4) competence.

A semantic differential scale using a set of fourteen bipolar adjectives was developed to assess attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process. The bipolar adjectives were chosen to represent

[1]Gordon, Ira J. Studying the child in school. New York: John Wiley & Son, 1966, p. 73. Scale and directions not to be reproduced without permission of the author.

a common vocabulary level of the Ss, as well as utilizing the criteria for the development of the semantic differential scale set forth by Osgood and Suci.[2] Twenty-one concepts were rated by the experimental group which included the 12 concepts rated by the control group.

Opinionnaires were developed to solicit responses from college and university administrators and faculty as well as from principals, teachers, and Career Opportunities Program staff members. Item ratings pertaining to effectiveness, cooperation, initiative, ability to do the job, etc. were collected and analyzed. Where a faculty member had had an opportunity to work with Ss from both the experimental and control groups, she was requested to make comparisons between groups on each of the items.

Self concept data were collected from the children on three instruments. The I Feel - Me Feel Self Concept Scale[3] was administered to children in grades K-4. The How I See Myself Self Concept Scale (Elementary Form) was administered to children in grades 5-6 and the secondary form of the same instrument was administered to children in grades 7-8.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed in order to test the overall objectives set forth in the Career Opportunities Program proposal and guidelines:

---

[2] Osgood, Charles & Suci, George. Factor analysis of meaning. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1955, p. 325.

[3] Yeatts, Perleane. Manual for the I Feel - Me Feel self concept scale. College of Education, University of Georgia: Athens, 1969.

I. There is no significant difference in self report, self concept between the Career Opportunities Program (COP) participants and regular teacher aides (non-COP) at the end of twelve program months and twenty-one program months, respectively.

II. There is no significant difference on the semantic differential ratings of various characteristics of the teaching process between the COP participants and non-COP participants at the end of the twelve program months and twenty-one program months, respectively.

III. There is no significant gain on semantic differential ratings of various characteristics pertinent to the Career Opportunities Program by the COP participants between data collection points.

IV. There is no significant difference in level of ratings by program staff and students on performance and personal characteristics between COP participants and non-COP participants at the end of twenty-one program months.

V. There is no significant difference between self report, self concept of children in classrooms where COP aides work and children in classrooms where non-COP aides work at the end of twenty-one program months.

Limitations

Developing a research design for a comprehensive, process oriented program such as the Career Opportunities Program was a formidable task. The overlap of COP participants into other Title I programs, many children under the tutilege of COP participants also being under Head Start or Follow Through programs, and trying to control for the many impact variables affecting attitudes and performances was close to impossible.

Although a major objective of the COP program is to improve the academic achievement levels of children in classrooms using COP trainees, no data were available from the school test bureau that provided comparison bases on experimental versus control subjects. Such data

collection has been planned for the third program year.

A second objective, "to help students to understand the value of achieving success in school" was considered too subjective to quantify and therefore was not considered in this evaluation.

The major thrust of this evaluation was confined to: 1) assessing the self concept and attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process of a sample of experimental and control Ss, 2) assessing the self concept of a sample of children in classrooms using COP aides and in classrooms using regular teacher aides, 3) and comparing ratings of university and public school staff concerning performance and personal characteristics of the COP and non-COP Ss.

CHAPTER III

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Data were collected on the sample of Career Opportunities Program (COP) participants and the control samples of regular teacher aides at two data collection points, September, 1971 and May, 1972 respectively. These data contained four (4) factor scores on a self report, self concept scale, twelve (12) comparative scales on characteristics of the teaching process and an additional nine (9) scales of similar attributes on the experimental group.

Faculty and administrators at the participating universities, Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth, provided ratings on 15 variables concerning personal and teaching attributes of the COP participants. Numerous ratings were also received from principals, teachers, team leaders and students pertaining to the performance and personal characteristics of the COP-aides.

Self report, self concept data were collected on 269 children who were students in the classroom where COP-aides were employed and for control purposes, 254 children who were members of classrooms where the regular teacher aides were employed.

In testing Hypothesis I, a significant difference was found at the end of twelve months between the experimental and control group Ss on only factor 1, interpersonal adequacy, of the How I See Myself Self Concept Scale (see Table 1). As seen in Table II, however, no significant differences were found between groups at the end of 21 months on any of the four (4) self concept factors. When the

Table I

Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP participants at the Conclusion of Twelve (12) Program Months

Factors	COP (n = 56)	non-COP (n = 56)	F-ratio[1]
Interpersonal Adequacy	55.73	50.53	4.68*
School and Physical Adequacy	41.45	42.00	.35
Personal Appearance	24.59	24.09	.33
Competence	21.04	19.69	2.99

[1] df = 1,110 * $p < .05$

gain in interpersonal adequacy between data collection points was considered, both the experimental and control groups had highly significant gains during this time period. No other factor means showed a significant change over this period of time.

Table II

Self Concept Factor Means and Corresponding F-ratios for COP and non-COP Participants at the Conclusion of Twenty-one (21) Program Months

Factors	COP (n = 49)	non-COP (n = 39)	F-ratio[1]
Interpersonal Adequacy	60.63	61.08	.10
School and Physical Adequacy	41.92	43.08	1.26
Personal Appearance	24.73	23.33	2.49
Competence	21.29	20.05	3.24

[1] df = 1,86

Data concerning Hypothesis II are given in Tables III and IV. As shown in Table III, at the conclusion of the first 12 months of the program significant differences between means favoring the control group were found in the semantic differential ratings of 1) my supervisor and 2) relationship to staff members (other than teachers). At the

Table III

Means and F-ratios for Twelve (12) Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of Twelve (12) Program Months

Characteristics	COP (n = 56)	non-COP (n = 56)	F-ratios[1]
My teacher	78.23	81.96	2.45
Classroom experiences	81.39	81.56	.01
School principal	73.80	78.18	2.37
Classroom organization	75.45	76.67	.26
Future school plans	81.86	81.04	.15
Planning sessions with teacher	76.92	75.53	.20
In-service training sessions	80.16	81.91	.79
Relationship to students in classroom	83.25	81.94	.52
My supervisor	73.82	81.08	5.04*
Relationship to staff members (other than teacher)	78.24	82.56	4.16*
Relationship to aides (other than COP aide)	81.21	83.00	.87
Relationship to COP aide	82.00	80.70	.41

[1] df = 1,110 * $p < .05$

end of 21 program months, significant differences favoring the control group were found on five semantic differential ratings. In

Table IV

Means and F-ratios for twelve (12) Semantic Differential Ratings on Various Characteristics of the Teaching Process for COP and non-COP Participants at the End of Twenty-one (21) Program Months

Characteristics	COP (n = 49)	non-COP (n = 39)	F-ratios[1]
My teacher	80.14	81.26	.21
Classroom experiences	81.10	83.23	1.22
School principal	74.93	79.74	2.33
Classroom organization	83.82	78.92	4.93*
Future school plans	81.15	84.00	1.97
Planning sessions with teacher	81.84	78.43	1.45
In-service training sessions	81.02	81.82	.14
Relationship to students in classroom	76.82	87.03	32.52**
My supervisor	73.98	84.03	12.42**
Relationship to staff members (other than teacher)	79.82	85.26	7.53**
Relationship to aides (other than COP aides)	74.57	85.72	30.74**
Relationship to COP aide	77.39	84.16	6.14*

[1] df = 1,86 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

addition to the two characteristics at the end of twelve months mentioned above,

relationship to students in classroom, relationship to aides (other than COP-aides) and relationship to COP-aides were also included at the end of 21 months. One significant difference favoring the experimental Ss was found on the characteristic of classroom organization.

The COP participant's ratings on classroom organization and planning session with teacher increased significantly between data collection points, while ratings on relationship to students in classroom and relationship to aides (other than COP-aides) decreased significantly. The non-COP participants on the contrary, showed significant gains on ratings of only one characteristic, that being, relationship to students in classroom. The control group had no semantic differential ratings showing a significant decrease between data collection points.

The data pertinent to Hypothesis III are presented in Table V. Attitudes of the COP-aides as measured by a semantic differential scale, increased significantly toward the Career Opportunities Program. Significant decreases were found, however, in their attitudes toward 1) college courses, 2) college professors, 3) college advisors, and 4) COP staff members (other than director).

Various opinionnaires and checklists were used to solicit data concerning the performance and personal characteristics of COP participants, and where applicable, comparisons between COP-aides and non-COP aides were requested from staff members who were in a position to make such comparisons.

Table V

Means and Corresponding t-Values for Attitudes Toward Selected COP Variables Collected at the Conclusion of 12 and 21 Months, Respectively

Attitudes Toward	12 Mos.	21 Mos.	t-value[1]
Career Opportunities Program	75.19	79.80	-2.3[illegible]
College courses	83.25	76.82	3.6
College professors	80.39	76.53	1.7
Team leaders	73.82	73.98	- .05
COP director	78.24	79.82	- .71
COP staff members (other than director)	81.21	74.57	3.27**
College advisors	82.00	77.39	1.82*
Help given by tutors	81.64	78.07	1.34
Relationship with tutors	81.27	78.12	1.12

[1] df = 48 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

The data in Table VI show the percent of ratings in each of three categories, good, fair, and poor on the evaluation checklist entitled "Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Universities Evaluation of COP-Aide". Ratings were received on five criteria for 35 of the COP-aides participating in this study. On the same form, supervising teachers recommended 97% of the COP-aides for continuation in the program.

The University Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire was completed by ten faculty members and administrators at Virginia Union

Table VI

Percentage of Ratings on Five Performance Criteria by Virginia Union and Virginia Commonwealth Supervising Teachers

Criteria	Percentage of Ratings		
	Good	Fair	Poor
Personal and social characteristics	84	13	3
Classroom management	83	17	0
Discipline	85	15	0
Professional attributes	91	7	2
Teaching Techniques	85	13	2

and Virginia Commonwealth. The data in Table VII show the distribution of responses for selected items on the form.

Table VII

Distribution of Ten Responses on Selected Criteria
From the University Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire

Criteria	Responses		
1. How does the academic progress of a Career Opportunities Program participant compare to any other college student in your university? or class?	Better	Same	Worse
	0	8	2
2. Do you feel a Career Opportunities Program student needs more of your time and counseling than does any other student?	Yes	No	NA
	1	8	1
3. Do you refer Career Opportunties Program participants for counseling more frequently than any other student?	0	9	1
4. Do Career Opportunities Program students seem to adjust to college life as readily as other students?	9	0	1
5. Do Career Opportunities Program students take advantage of your posted office hours?	5	2	3
6. Do Career Opportunities Program students seem satisfied with their progress in your class?	7	0	3
7. Do Career Opportunities Program students have self-motivation or does it seem to take more motivation on your part to get them going?	Own Motivation	Need Teacher Motivation	NA
	7	0	3
8. Do the Career Opportunities Program students participate in class discussions as well as other students?	Yes	No	NA
	7	0	3
9. How does class attendance of Career Opportunities Program students compare to other students?	Better	Same	Worse
	0	8	2
10. Does the Career Opportuntiies Program fit into the overall philosophy of your university?	Yes	No	NA
	9	0	1

Table VII - Continued

Criteria	Responses		
11. Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers?	Yes	No	NA
	9	1	0
12. Should a Career Opportunities Program be given to people from all socio-economic classes rather than to just people from the lower socio-economic class?	9	1	0
13. What problems and issues have arisen administratively due to the admittance of Career Opportunities Program?	NA	None	Other
	1	9	0

Thirteen public school principals having had both COP-aides and non-COP aides in their schools were asked to respond to the Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire. Table VIII presents the distribution of responses on the comparison of COP-aides to regular teaching aides on ten selected attributes.

Table VIII

Distribution of Thirteen Responses from Principals on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP aides

Attribute	Ratings		
	Greater	Same	Poorer
Effectiveness	6	7	0
Interest in Job	7	6	0
Cooperation	7	6	0
Ability to do job	8	5	0
Initiation	8	4	1
Social maturity	6	7	0
Promptness	4	7	2
Intelligence	7	6	0
Working with Kids	9	4	0
Ability to get along with others	6	7	0

Similar comparisons were made by teachers in the public schools who had had both regular teacher aides and COP-aides under their supervision. A sample of twenty-seven (27) teachers completed the Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire. Their responses comparing COP-aides

against regular teacher aides on the same ten (10) attributes as did principals appear in Table IX.

Table IX

Distribution of Twenty-Seven Responses From Teachers on Selected Performance Attributes Exhibited by COP-Aides When Compared to non-COP Aides

Attribute	Ratings		
	Greater	Same	Poorer
Effectiveness	24	3	0
Interest in Job	18	9	0
Cooperation	16	11	0
Ability to do job	23	4	0
Initiation	20	4	3
Social maturity	18	9	0
Promptness	16	9	2
Intelligence	20	7	0
Working with Kids	19	8	0
Ability to get along	16	11	0

Two additional questions were asked of principals and teachers soliciting a positive or negative reply. They were 1) "Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers?" and 2) "Should a Career Opportunities Program be given to people at all socio-economic level?" In response to question 1, 95% of the principals and teachers answered in the affirmative, and on question 2, 100% in the affirmative.

In an open response question, teachers and principals were asked to list changes they had seen occur in the COP-aides and to indicate whether these changes were positive or negative. Several items occurred repeatedly and always with a positive reflection. Some of the changes listed were:

1. Willingness to work with children
2. Increasing competence with additional college training
3. Listens to and advises children more often
4. Ability to work with small groups of children
5. Willingness to share ideas with teacher

Each school having two or more COP-aides employed had a teacher who was assigned duties as a team leader. Due to misconstrition of the directions on the Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire, most teachers assuming both roles answered the teacher opinionnaire form, therefore causing only four opinionnaires to reflect their view points as team leaders. The evaluators chose not to use these responses because of such a small sample.

Students in classrooms having a Career Opportunities Program aide responded to a six item questionnaire regarding the aides performance and personal characteristics. The responses of 274 students, grouped in three categories, are given in Table X. The students were in grades four (4) through eight (8) representing fifteen (15) schools.

Table X

Distribution of 274 Responses From Students on Selected Performance and Personal Characteristics Exhibited by COP-Aides Ratings (in percent)

Characteristic	Yes, Very Much	Yes, Sometimes	No, Not Much
1. Did the aide treat you with respect?	85	14	1
2. Has the aide been fair to you?	85	14	1
3. Has the aide given you enough help in the classroom?	81	16	3
4. Would you like to have her as a teacher aide next year?	80	12	8
5. Did the aide dress in good taste?	88	12	0
6. Did the aide ever bluff you or the group in order to cover up for not knowing something?	15	10	75

Not all COP-aides participate as a classroom aide. Several aides work as physical education aides in schools and as library aides in school libraries. None of these aides were in the sample participating in this evaluation study; however, the evaluation did collect evaluation reports on several of these people. The results of these reports were quite similar to those reported previously on the COP-aides working in classrooms, in that their supervisors rated them very high on job performance skills and personal characteristics. Of eighteen (18) reports received,

principals recommended continuation on the job for all of them.

Three different instruments were used to assess the self concept of children in classrooms where COP-aides and regular teacher aides were employed. The data collected were analyzed at three levels,those being grades K-4, 5-6, and 7-8. The data in Table XI show the self concept means of experimental versus control for students in grades kindergarten

Table XI

Means and Corresponding F-Ratios For the I Feel - Me Feel Self Concept Scale for Kindergarten Through Fourth Grade of Experimental and Control Groups

Experimental	Control	F-ratio[1]
164.26	163.32	.19

[1] df = 1,278

through fourth. The means for grades 5-6 are given in Table XII. A significant difference was found between groups on Factor 1, Interpersonal Adequacy, favoring the experimental group.

Table XII

Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 5-6 of the Experimental and Control Groups

Factors	Experimental	Control	F-ratio[1]
1	49.34	46.23	3.98*
2	37.63	35.84	1.88
3	22.86	21.40	2.02
4	25.16	23.60	2.67

[1] df = 1,120 * $p < .05$

In Table XIII, which shows the means and F-ratios for grades 7-8, it is seen that one significant difference exists on Factor 2, School and Physical Adequacy, favoring the children in the experimental group.

Table XIII

Means and Corresponding F-ratios from the HISM Self Concept, Scales for Grades 7-8 of the Experimental and Control Groups

Factors	Experimental	Control	F-ratios[1]
1	45.16	43.81	.86
2	37.20	34.25	6.20*
3	24.43	23.58	.80
4	26.80	26.04	.63

[1] df = 1,119 * $p < .05$

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the Career Opportunities Program in Richmond, Virginia from its conception in the Fall, 1970 until Spring, 1971. Five broad program objectives were stated producing five general hypotheses which were tested in order to ascertain the extent to which these objectives were fulfilled. Because the evaluation team did not begin their assessment until the completion of the first program year, it was impossible to control a number of concomitant variables that undoubtedly influenced self concept and attitudes of the subjects as well as the achievement of the children.

The analysis of data pertaining to the self concept of Career Opportunities Program and non-COP aides indicated no difference as to how they see "self" or how it relates to their adequacy of working with others, their personal appearance or their perception of competency on the job. Except for the factor of interpersonal adequacy, the self report, self concepts remained quite stable during the second program year.

Attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process differed very little between the experimental and control group at the end of twelve (12) program months. The regular teacher aides thought more highly of their immediate supervisor and had a better relationship toward staff members (other than teacher) than did the COP aides. No significant differences appeared between groups on the other ten (10) characteristics.

Significant changes occurred on several characteristics at the end of the second program year. The differences favored the control group on 1) relationship to students in the classroom, 2) relationship to aides (other than COP-aides) and 3) relationship to COP-aides as well as the two characteristics noted above at the conclusion of twelve (12) months. The only significant difference favoring the experimental group was on the characteristic labeled, attitude toward classroom organization.

These findings are not surprising to the evaluators. Each of these characteristics showing significance favoring the control group represent attitudes toward other people. The typical college training preparing students as classroom teachers tends to sensitize them in their relationship to supervisors and other colleagues. It is even more apparent when consideration is given to the in-service training given the COP-aides during the second program year which tended to overemphasize personal relationships and cooperative efforts. It seems to have had a negative effect in this particular situation.

At the same time, the COP-aides increased significantly in their attitude toward classroom organization, as compared to the non-COP aides. This is probably attributed to their increasingly good relationship with their teachers with whom they worked, as was documented on the teacher ratings scales comparing COP-aides to regular teacher aides.

Further evidence of a decreasing concern for other people by the COP-aides was shown by the change in attitudes toward college professors, COP staff members (other than the director), and college advisors during

the second program year. It is interesting to note, however, that the COP-aides attitudes toward the COP program itself increased significantly during the same time period.

The evaluators are well aware that the COP participants self concept and attitudes toward various characteristics of the teaching process are but two of the many variables contributing to the overall assessment of the COP program. As discussed in Chapter II, Research Design and Methodology, the complexity and overlapping with other programs make it difficult to distinguish any cause and effect relationships.

When consideration is given to the attitudes of those people who see the program in operation and have the opportunity to "live" with the participants in their day to day experiences, the picture is quite different. This is substantiated by various data. Enriching experiences are provided for the participants, for example, field trips to observe other COP sites. These trips included visits to the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Florida, North Carolina, Michigan and the District of Columbia. During the second year of operation the grade point average (GPA) distribution for COP-aides was the following: above average - 20%, average - 65%, below average - 15%. (The average GPA is that of the undergraduate student body of the college or university attended by each COP-aide.)

The attrition rate of COP participants the first year (1970-71) was 18% and the second year (1971-72) was 14%. The average attrition rate for both years was 15%. The reasons for attrition were varied, some being poor health, poor attendance, pregnancy, better employment,

and change to another program because of better benefits. To date, three COP-aides have successfully completed the bachelor's degree.

Not only do these data evidence success within the COP-aide group, but other data indicate substantial changes being made within the cooperating university systems. The following changes have occurred due to the Career Opportunities Program:

1. Foreign language requirements dropped at Virginia Union University.
2. Specially designed courses (orientation to teaching) in both universities.
3. On-site teaching (holding some classes on-site in the school where the aide works) in both universities.
4. Redesigning math requirements for all students at Virginia Commonwealth University.
5. Offering three hours of practicum credits for work experience each semester in both universities.
6. Tutorial assistance from both universities.
7. Cooperation of professors at both universities to serve on Career Opportunities Program Council.
8. Utilizing some Richmond Public School principals as adjunct faculty members at both universities.
9. Allowing freshmen to take junior and senior courses related to the job. For example, Career Opportunities Program participants were allowed to take courses (i.e., art in the elementary school) according to their needs, interest and the level and capacity in which they work.

Every segment of the community questionnaire, from college faculty to children in the classroom, overwhelmingly rated the Career Opportunities Program participants higher than regular teacher aides in all categories assessing job performance and personal characteristics. This documentation

by non-biased observers substantially supports the efforts and outcome of the Career Opportunities Program.

In terms of the foregoing assessment the following recommendations are made:

1. A concentrated effort be made by the Career Opportunities Program staff to work with the COP participants in the areas of:

    a. human relations
    b. group process interactions
    c. self concept development
    d. communication skills with children

2. A concentrated effort be made by the Career Opportunities Program staff to work more closely with the cooperating universities in the areas of:

    a. registration procedures
    b. classroom supervision of the COP-aide
    c. use of tutors

3. A better defined role be made for the team leader in terms of duties, responsibilities and activities.

APPENDICES

STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF AIDE

	Yes, Very Much	Yes, Sometimes	No, Not Much
1. Did the aide treat you with respect?	1	2	3
2. Has the aide been fair to you?	1	2	3
3. Has the aide given you enough help in the classroom?	1	2	3
4. Would you like to have her as a teacher aide next year?	1	2	3
5. Did the aide dress in good taste?	1	2	3
6. Did the aide ever bluff you or the group in order to cover up for not knowing something?	1	2	3

VIRGINIA UNION AND VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITIES EVALUATION OF COP AIDE

Teacher Aide_____ Supervising Teacher_____

School_____ Grade_____ Year_____

Check the criteria listed below with a check mark in the appropriate column opposite each item. Ratings are made on the basis of (good, fair , poor).

I. PERSONAL AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

	Good	Fair	Poor
Attendance			
Attractiveness in appearance (general appropriateness of grooming)			
Consideration, courtesy, tact			
Carefulness - accuracy - thoroughness			
Co-operation - helpfulness, loyalty			
Dependability			
Enthusiasm and alertness			
Forcefulness - decisiveness, firmness			
Leadership - initiative, self-confidence			
Emotional stability			
Originality and resourcefulness			
Punctuality			

II. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Attention to physical condition of classroom				
Care of books, materials and equipment				
Records and reports (if appliable)				
Skill in pupil management as shown by such pupil activities as (a) attention to his own work (b) attention of individual to the work of the entire group	a.			
	b.			

III. DISCIPLINE

Disciplinarian			
Does the teacher aide adjust to new or Changing situations			

IV. PROFESSIONAL ATTRIBUTES

Command of English			
(a) grammar			
(b) usage			
Understanding of children			
Relationship with teacher			
Attitude toward children			
Interest in classroom activities			

(over)

	Good	Fair	Poor
Attitude toward work			
Effective response to suggestions			
Willingness to work hard			
To your knowledge relationship with principal			
To your knowledge general relationship with other staff			
Teacher aide's - Areas of strengths:			
Teacher aide's - Areas of weaknesses:			

VIRGINIA UNION AND VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITIES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

V. TEACHING TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHER AIDES (mark which are applicable)

TEACHER EVALUATION SHEET OF YOUR PROGRESS

Cut letters for the bulletin board			
Manuscript the alphabet on tag board			
Write on the chalkboard			
Prepare dittoes (typed or untyped)			
Prepare attendance slips			
Fill out information in a register			
Supervise outdoor activities			
Set up learning centers in the classroom			
Read stories to the class			

Signature of Evaluator_____

Signature of Aide_____

VI. TO BE COMPLETED BY BUILDING PRINCIPAL

Do you recommend this aide for continuation in the program?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If you checked "no" kindly explain, if there are reasons other than those checked on this instrument.

COMMENTS:

Principal's signature_____

Career Opportunities Program

Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire
January, 1972

1. Name_____ 2. Title_____

3. School_____

4. How long have you been working or associated with Career Opportunities Program Aides?

_____

5. Have you worked with a regular teacher aide as well as a Career Opportunity Program Aide?

Yes_____ No_____

6. How do you compare the Career Opportunities Program aide to the regular teacher aide in terms of:

		Circle One		
(a)	Effectiveness	greater	same	poorer
(b)	Interest in job	greater	same	poorer
(c)	Cooperation	greater	same	poorer
(d)	Ability to do job	greater	same	poorer
(e)	Initiative	greater	same	poorer
(f)	Social maturity	greater	same	poorer
(g)	Promptness	greater	same	poorer
(h)	Intelligence	greater	same	poorer
(i)	Working with Children	greater	same	poorer
(j)	Ability to get along with others	greater	same	poorer

7. Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers?

Yes_____ No_____

8. Should a Career Opportunities Program be open to people at all socio-economic levels rather than just those at the lower socio-economic level?

Yes_____ No_____

9. (For tutors only) Do the Career Opportunities Program aides request your services on a regular basis?

Yes_____ No_____

10. (For tutors only) Do you feel the tutoring program for Career Opportunities Program aides has been worth your time and effort?

Yes_____ No_____

11. (For principals and team leaders only) What problems and issues have arisen administratively due to the Career Opportunities Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. What changes have you seen occur in Career Opportunities Program aides since they have been in the program? Are the changes positive or negative?

_____

_____

_____

13. What relationship do you have with Virginia Commonwealth University or Virginia Union University in terms of the Career Opportunities Program? Meetings, etc?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Career Opportunities Program

University Faculty and Administrative Opinionnaire
January, 1972

1. Name_____ 2. Title_____

3. University_____

4. How long have you been working with Career Opportunities Program Aides?_____

5. How does the academic progress of a Career Opportunities Program participant compare to any other college student in your university? or class?

   Circle one - Better Same Worse

6. Do you feel a Career Opportunities Program student needs more of your time and counselling than does any other student? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

7. Do you to refer Career Opportunities Program participants for counselling more frequently than any other student? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

8. Do Career Opportunities Program students seem to adjust to college life as readily as other students? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

9. Do Career Opportunities Program students take advantage of your posted office hours? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

10. Do Career Opportunities Program students seem satisfied with their progress in your class? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

11. Do Career Opportunities Program students have self-motivation or does it seem to take more motivation on your part to get them going?

    Have own motivation _____

    Need teacher's motivation _____

    NA _____

12. Do the Career Opportunities Program students participate in class discussions as well as other students? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

13. How does class attendance of Career Opportunities Program students compare to other students? Circle one: Better Same Worse

14. Does the Career Opportunities Program fit into the overall philosophy of your university? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

15. Do you think the Career Opportunities Program is an appropriate way to train teachers? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

16. Should a Career Opportunities Program be given to people from all socio-economic classes rather than to just people from the lower socio-economic class? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

17. What problems and issues have arisen administratively due to the admittance of Career Opportunities Program? NA, None, or _____

_____

_____

_____

18. As a tutor, do the Career Opportunities Program aides request your services on a regular basis? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

19. As a tutor, do you feel the tutoring program for Career Opportunities Program aides has been work your time and effort? Yes ___ No ___ NA ___

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
FOR NON-CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM TEACHER AIDES

Richmond, Virginia

I feel that my teacher is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my experiences in the classroom have been:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
xciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the school principal is:

Strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Weak
Good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Bad
Dirty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Clean
Exciting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Boring
Permanent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Changing
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Soft
Fair	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfair
Kind	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Successful
Wise	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Foolish
Slow	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Fast

I feel that the organization in my classroom is:

Strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Weak
Good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Bad
Dirty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Clean
Exciting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Boring
Permanent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Changing
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Soft
Fair	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfair
Kind	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Successful
Wise	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Foolish
Slow	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Fast

I feel that my future school plans are:

Strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Weak
Good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Bad
Dirty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Clean
Exciting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Boring
Permanent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Changing
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Soft
Fair	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfair
Kind	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Successful
Wise	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Foolish
Slow	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Fast

I feel that the planning sessions with any teacher are:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the in-service training sessions are:

Strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Weak
Good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Bad
Dirty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Clean
Exciting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Boring
Permanent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Changing
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Soft
Fair	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfair
Kind	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Successful
Wise	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Foolish
Slow	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Fast

I feel that the relationship with the students in my classroom is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my supervisor is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to staff members (other than my teacher) is:

Strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Weak
Good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Bad
Dirty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Clean
Exciting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Boring
Permanent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Changing
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Soft
Fair	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfair
Kind	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Successful
Wise	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Foolish
Slow	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to aides (other than Career Opportunities Program aides) is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to Career Opportunities Program aides is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
FOR CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM AIDES

Richmond, Virginia

I feel that the Career Opportunities Program is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	Fast

I feel that my teacher is:

Strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Weak
Good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Bad
Dirty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Clean
Exciting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Boring
Permanent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Changing
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Soft
Fair	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfair
Kind	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Successful
Wise	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Foolish
Slow	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Fast

I feel that my college courses are:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my college professors are:

Strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Weak
Good	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Bad
Dirty	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Clean
Exciting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Boring
Permanent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Changing
Valuable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Soft
Fair	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfair
Kind	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Successful
Wise	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Foolish
Slow	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Fast

I feel that my experiences in the classroom have been:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the school principal is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the team leader is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ .	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the organization in my classroom is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my future school plans are:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the planning sessions with any teacher are:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the in-service training sessions are:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the Career Opportunities Program Director is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the Career Opportunities Program staff members (other than Director) are:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the relationship with the students in my classroom is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my college advisors are:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my supervisor is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to staff members (other than my teacher) is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to aides (other than Career Opportunities Program aides) is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my relationship to Career Opportunities Program aides is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that the help given to me by my tutor is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast

I feel that my relationship with my tutor is:

Strong	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Weak
Good	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Bad
Dirty	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Clean
Exciting	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Boring
Permanent	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Changing
Valuable	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Worthless
Pleasant	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unpleasant
Hard	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Soft
Fair	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Unfair
Kind	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Cruel
Meaningful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Meaningless
Unsuccessful	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Successful
Wise	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Foolish
Slow	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___ :	___	Fast